

**Remarks**

The Examiner allowed claims 21–31 and 42, rejected claims 1, 5, 8–11, 18–20, 32, 36, and 39–41 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Griffiths et al. (US 6,740,172), and objected to claims 2–4, 6, 7, 12–17, 33–35, 37, and 38. The rejection is traversed. Claims 1–42 remain in the application.

In his § 102(e) anticipation rejection of independent claims 1, 11, 32, 40, and 41 and dependent claims 5, 8–10, 18–20, 36, and 39, the Examiner stated that Griffiths et al. discloses a sprocket that includes a shaft on which it is mounted, a hub with a bore for the shaft, and an outer sprocket periphery with surfaces that are laterally offset relative to one another and that contact an area of the inner belt surface that varies laterally. MPEP § 2131 provides: “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Contrary to the Examiner’s suggestion that Griffiths et al. discloses all the elements of the rejected claims, Griffiths et al. does not disclose, for example, a sprocket with an outer periphery forming circumferentially spaced drive surfaces. Furthermore, Griffiths et al. does not disclose a sprocket mounted on a shaft for rotation with the shaft as in rejected independent claims 11 and 41. As shown in the drawings and described at col. 4, ll. 20–22, the Griffiths et al. sprockets present smooth outer peripheries on sprocket sectors that “provide sufficient gripping surfaces to prevent slippage of the belt as it rotates about the sprockets.” The outer peripheries of the sprocket sectors in Griffiths et al. do not have circumferentially spaced drive surfaces. Furthermore, in

Griffiths et al., the sprockets rotate about a non-rotating hollow shaft (for example, col. 1, l. 38; col. 1, l. 60; col. 2, ll. 23–25; col. 3, ll. 52–54). They do not rotate with the shaft as in claims 11 and 41. Therefore, the 35 USC § 102(e) rejection of independent claims 1, 11, 32, 40, and 41 and dependent claims 5, 8–10, 18–20, 36, and 39 is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 5, 8–11, 18–20, 32, 36, and 39–41 and the objection to claims 2–4, 6, 7, 12–17, 33–35, 37, and 38 and their allowance in view of these remarks.

This response is being mailed with a petition for a one-month extension of time. The extension of time fee and any other fees deemed necessary for consideration of this response may be charged to Deposit Account No. 12-0090. If the Examiner thinks a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, he is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kevin W. Guernsey et al.

Date: Mar. 6, 2006

By: James T. Cronvich  
James T. Cronvich  
Reg. No. 33163  
Laitram, L.L.C.  
220 Laitram Lane  
Harahan, LA 70123  
Telephone: (504) 570-1243  
Fax: (504) 734-5233